

Chapter 4

FISCAL IMPACTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

The following is a fiscal evaluation of the April 2005 applications to amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) from county departments and agencies responsible for supplying and maintaining infrastructure and services relevant to the CDMP. The evaluation estimates the incremental and cumulative impact the costs of the required infrastructure and service, and the extent to which the costs will be borne by the property owners or will require general taxpayer support and includes an estimate of that support.

The infrastructure and services and associated agencies responsible for planning, providing and maintaining those services are the following:

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Solid Waste | Miami-Dade Department of Solid Waste Management |
| Water and Sewer | Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department |
| Park and Recreation | Miami-Dade Park and Recreation Department |
| Mass Transit | Miami-Dade Transit Agency |
| Fire and Rescue Service | Miami-Dade Fire and Rescue Department |
| Roadways | Miami-Dade Public Works Department |
| Flood Protection | Miami-Dade Department of Environmental Resource Management |
| Public Schools | Miami-Dade County Public Schools |

The agencies used various methodologies to make their calculations. The agencies rely on a variety of sources for revenue, such as, property taxes, impact fees, connection fees, user fees, gas taxes, taxing districts, general fund contribution, federal and state grants; federal funds, etc. Certain variables, such as property use, location, number of dwelling units, and type of units were considered by the service agencies in developing their cost estimates.

The evaluations are organized by the services, on capital expenditure as listed above. The Miami-Dade County Public Schools, are responding only to those applications requesting residential uses. As of the date of printing this report, the Park and Recreation and Public Works Departments' fiscal evaluations of the applications have not been completed, therefore, those evaluations will be included in a supplement.

Solid Waste

The summaries provided below describe the anticipated impact and any associated cost of the applications on Solid Waste Collection and Disposal services and facilities.

Concurrency

Since the DSWM assesses capacity system-wide based, in part, on existing waste delivery commitments from both the private and public sectors, it is not possible to make determinations concerning the adequacy of solid waste disposal facilities relative to each individual application. Instead, this DSWM issues a periodic assessment of the County's status in terms of 'concurrency' – that is, the ability to maintain a minimum of five (5) years of waste disposal capacity system-wide. The County is committed to maintaining this level in compliance with Chapter 163, Part II F.S. and currently exceeds that standard by nearly four (4) years.

Residential Collection and Disposal Service

The incremental cost of adding a residential unit to the DSWM Service Area, which includes the disposal cost of waste, is offset by the annual fee charges to the user. Currently, that fee is \$399 per residential unit. For a residential dumpster, the current fee is \$308. The average residential unit currently generates approximately 3.0 tons of waste annually, which includes garbage, trash and recycled waste.

As reported in March 2005 to the State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, the full cost per unit of providing waste Collection Service was \$370 including disposal and other Collections services such as, illegal dumping clean-up and code enforcement.

Waste Disposal Capacity and Service

The incremental and cumulative cost of providing disposal capacity for DSWM Collections, private haulers and municipalities are paid for by the users. The DSWM charges a disposal tipping fee at a contract rate of \$52.25 per ton to DSWM Collections and to those private haulers and municipalities with long term disposal agreements with the Department. For non-contract haulers, the rate is \$68.90. These rates adjust annually with the Consumer Price Index, South. In addition, the DSWM charges a Disposal Facility Fee to private haulers equal to 15 percent of their annual gross receipts, which is targeted to ensure capacity in operations. Landfill closure is funded by a portion of the Utility Service Fee charged to all retail and wholesale customers of the County's Water and Sewer Department.

Water and Sewer

The Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department provides for the majority of water and sewer service throughout the county.

The cost estimates provided herein are preliminary and final project costs will vary from these estimates. The final costs for the project and resulting feasibility will depend on actual labor and material costs, competitive market conditions, final project scope implementation schedule, continuity of personnel and other variable factors.

IMPACT FEES PAID BY DEVELOPER

| Application No. | Total Usage (gpd) | Water Impact Fee | Sewer Impact Fee | Connection Fee ¹ | Annual O&M Cost |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 84,750 | 117,803 | 474600 | \$1,200 | 65,156 |
| 2 | 8,500 | 11,815 | 47600 | \$1,200 | 6,535 |
| 3 | 67,201 | 93,409 | 376325 | \$1,200 | 51,664 |
| 4 | 178,750 | 248,463 | 1001000 | \$1,200 | 137,423 |
| 5 | 325,946 | 453,065 | 1825300 | \$1,200 | 250,587 |
| 6 | 1,089 | 1,514 | 6098 | \$1,200 | 837 |
| 7 | 28,226 | 39,234 | 158067 | \$1,200 | 21,700 |
| 8 | 7,500 | 10,425 | 42000 | \$1,200 | 5,766 |
| 9 | 1,843 | 2,561 | 10318 | \$1,200 | 1,417 |
| 10 | 405,650 | 563,854 | 2271640 | \$1,200 | 311,864 |
| 11 | 58,205 | 80,905 | 325946 | \$1,200 | 44,748 |
| 12 | 8,712 | 12,110 | 48787 | \$1,200 | 6,698 |
| 13 | 171,150 | 237,899 | 958440 | \$1,200 | 131,580 |
| 14 | 12,977 | 18,037 | 72668 | \$1,200 | 9,976 |
| 15 | 28,253 | 39,272 | 158217 | \$1,200 | 21,721 |
| 16 | 50,363 | 70,005 | 282033 | \$1,200 | 38,719 |
| 17 | 271,368 | 377,202 | 1519661 | \$1,200 | 208,628 |
| 18 | 46,535 | 64,684 | 260597 | \$1,200 | 35,776 |
| 19 | 1,830 | 2,543 | 10245 | \$1,200 | 1,407 |
| 20 | 4,025 | 5,595 | 22539 | \$1,200 | 3,094 |
| 21 | 810 | 1,126 | 4537 | \$1,200 | 623 |
| 22 | 331,200 | 460,368 | 1854720 | \$1,200 | 254,626 |
| 23 | 94,635 | 131,542 | 529953 | \$1,200 | 72,755 |
| 24 | 18,753 | 26,066 | 105014 | \$1,200 | 14,417 |

¹Connection fee based on a 1" service line and meter

Source: Miami-Dade County Water and Sewer Department, 2005

The impact fee, connection fee, and annual operation and maintenance cost associated with each application is provided. The water impact fee was calculated at a rate of \$1.39 per gallon per day (gpd), and the sewer impact was calculated at a rate of \$5.60 per gpd. The annual Operations and Maintenance (O&M) cost was based on \$0.8308 gallons for the water, and \$1.2755 gallons for the sewer. The connection was based on providing a one-inch service line and meter. The construction connection charges may apply to a particular application but cannot be provided until construction of the development has been completed. The developer pays for these costs at various development order stages, such as; plat application and building permit application.

| WATER & SEWER IMPACTS IN PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAYS | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Application | Water Line Extension | | Sewer Line Extension | | Eng. Fees and Contingency | Total Cost |
| | Linear Feet | Cost | Linear Feet | Cost | | |
| 1 | 45 | \$130 | 430 | \$130 | \$ 16,364 | \$ 78,114 |
| 2* | 0 | 0 | 3,635 1^ | \$143 \$350,00 | \$229,999 | \$1,100,303 |
| 3** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 75 1,125 | \$130 \$155 | 2,390 | \$130 | \$131,129 | \$625,954 |
| 5*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 1,125 | \$155 | 1,265 | \$134 | \$94,827 | \$452,661 |
| 7 | 1,250 305 | \$155 \$178 | 340 1^ | \$155 \$350,000 | \$172,446 | \$823,186 |
| 8 | 50 | \$130 | 15 | \$130 | \$2,239 | \$10,689 |
| 9 | 540 | \$130 | 30 | \$130 | \$19,637 | \$93,737 |
| 10 | 1,680 5,315 3,251 | \$291 \$155 \$178 | 40 40 2^ | \$130 \$143 \$500,000 | \$769,110 | \$3,671,413 |
| 11 | 3,420 190 | \$291 \$155 | 1^ | \$500,000 | \$132,500 | \$632,500 |
| 12 | 50 | \$155 | 75 | \$130 | \$4,638 | \$22,138 |
| 13 | 2,650 | \$155 | 2,000 1^ | \$155 \$350,000 | \$283,749 | \$1,354,499 |
| 14 | 50 | \$130 | 330 | \$130 | \$13,091 | \$62,491 |
| 15 | 1,540 40 | \$254 \$155 | 220 1^^ | \$130 \$6,000 | \$114,469 | \$546,429 |
| 16 | 1,000 | \$155 | 40 | \$130 | \$42,453 | \$202,653 |
| 17 | 5,900 6,800 | \$178 \$155 | 3^ | \$500,000 | \$955,113 | \$4,559,313 |
| 18 | 720 | \$155 | 750 1^^ | \$143 \$6,000 | \$59,585 | \$284,435 |
| 19 | 400 | \$155 | 990 2^^ | \$130 \$6,000 | \$53,716 | \$256,416 |

| WATER & SEWER IMPACTS IN PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAYS | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Application | Water Line Extension | | Sewer Line Extension | | Eng. Fees and Contingency | Total Cost |
| | Linear Feet | Cost | Linear Feet | Cost | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 20 | 650 | \$155 | 20 | \$130 | \$27,388 | \$130,738 |
| 21< | 225 | \$155 | | 0 | \$9,242 | \$44,117 |
| 22 | 3,100 3,200 | \$155 \$178 | Parcel A 1,025 Parcel B 1,700 1^ | \$130 \$178 \$500,000 | \$526,277 | \$2,512,227 |
| 23**** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24**** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Estimating Disclaimer:

The final costs of the project and resulting feasibility will depend on actual labor and material costs, competitive market conditions, final project scope implementation schedule, continuity of personnel and other variable factors. Accordingly, the final project costs will vary from the estimate. The costs provided herein are based on Miami-Dade County water and sewer unit cost.

- * Water service area belongs to the City of North Miami Beach
- ** Water and sewer service area belongs to the City of North Miami
- *** Water and sewer service area belongs to the City of Hialeah
- **** Water and sewer service area belongs to the City of Homestead
- < No sewer available
- ^ Public Pump Station
- ^^ Manhole

Source: Miami-Dade County Water & Sewer Department

Mass Transit

Application 1

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 64 where application 1 is located. If granted, the expected transit impact produced is an increase of about 38 additional transit trips, which would not warrant additional changes beyond those already planned for the area. However, a minor extension of the Route 91 or 99 would be recommended to properly serve the area.

Application 2

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 222, where Application 2 is being requested. The expected transit impact produced by Application No. 2 is minimal and, therefore, the number of transit trips generated by the application would not warrant changes beyond those already planned for the area.

Application 3

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zones 200 and 201, where Application 3 is being requested. The expected transit impact produced by Application No. 3 varies depending on the Alternative used. Alternative 3A would produce 80 additional transit trips and Alternative 3B would produce 82 additional transit trips. This area is well served by transit and all future improvements. No further changes to the transit system are warranted. However, a new stop for the Biscayne MAX would be created by this application and pull-out bus bays will be necessary at this location and will be required in the future from the applicant.

Application 4

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 370, where Application 4 is being requested. The expected transit impact is estimated in 88 additional transit trips. This increase in the number of transit trips would warrant minor changes to the transit system beyond those already planned for the area. Route 33 would need to have the headways increased to accommodate capacity and properly serve the area.

Application 5

A trip-generation analysis was performed for Traffic Analysis Zone 5 and 7, where Application No. 5 is being requested. Only three additional transit trips are estimated to be produce by the application. If granted, there will be no variation on the transit trip generation and no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area.

Application 6

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zones 832, where the Application 6 is being requested. The expected transit impact by Application No. 6 is minimal.

If granted, this Application would not warrant changes beyond those already planned for the area.

Application 7

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 836, where the Application 7 is being requested, 24 additional transit trips would be generated by the Application. Therefore no changes beyond those already planned for the area would be warranted.

Application 8

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone TAZ 1031 where Application 8 is being requested. The trip generation analysis indicates that if the application is granted there would be no variation on the transit trip generation and, therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area would be warranted.

Application 9

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone TAZ 993 where Application 9 is being requested. There will be no variation on the transit trip generation as a result of this application and, therefore, no additional changes beyond those already planned for the area would be necessary.

Application 10

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone TAZ 844 where the Application 10 is being requested. The analysis indicates that this application, if granted, would generate 213 additional transit trips. There are many transit improvements programmed for this area; therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area will be necessary. However, a new bus stop would be created for this application and for the buses that transverse this area and pull-out bus bays will be necessary at this location and required in the future from the applicant.

Application 11

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1251 where Application 11 is being requested. The analysis indicates that this application would add four more transit trips and, therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area would be warranted.

Application 12

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1229 where Application 12 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the transit impact generated by this application will cause no variation on the transit trip generation of this TAZ and, therefore, no changes beyond those already planned for the area are necessary.

Application 13

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zones 1254 and 1255 where Application 13 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the transit impact produced by this application would generate 26 additional transit trips; however, this impact wouldn't warrant additional changes in transit service beyond those already planned for the area.

Application 14

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1216 where Application 14 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the transit impact produced by this application will cause no variation on the transit trip generation and, therefore, no changes beyond those already planned for the area are warranted.

Application 15

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1285 where Application 15 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the requested application will generate 80 additional transit trips. Many improvements are planned for the study area, including a new route, the Quail Roost MAX, which will serve the nearby area and, therefore, no additional changes beyond those already planned for the area would be necessary.

Application 16

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1194 and 1326 where Application 16 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the requested application will cause no variation on the transit trip generation and, therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area will be warranted.

Application 17

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zones 1287 and 1296 where Application 17 is being requested. The analysis indicates that the requested application will cause no variation on the transit trip generation and, therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area will be necessary.

Application 18

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1340 where application 18 is being requested. The analysis indicates that this application, if granted, would generate 144 additional transit trips. As presented in Table F-2 improvements are planned for the study area, including improvements to three routes traveling within a half mile of the property. As a result of this application, a minor extension of the Route 70 would be recommended to properly serve the area. Pullout bus bays will be necessary at this location and will be required in the future from the applicant.

Application 19, 20 and 21

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zones 1343, 1370 and 1369 where applications 19, 20 and 21 are being requested. The analyses indicate that these applications, if granted, would produce no variation on the transit trip generation and, therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area would be warranted.

Application 22

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1372 where application 22 is being requested. The analysis indicates that this application, if granted, this application will generate 32 additional transit trips. Improvements are planned for the study area, including two routes traveling within a quarter mile of the application site. Therefore, no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area would be necessary.

Application 23

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1397 where Application 23 is being requested. The analysis indicates that this application, if granted, would generate only nine additional transit trips. Therefore, there will be no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area.

Application 24

A trip-generation analysis was performed in the Traffic Analysis Zone 1397 where Application 24 is being requested. In TAZ 1397, where Application No. 24 is requested, the analysis indicates that this application, if granted, would generate only six additional transit trips. Therefore, there will be no expected changes beyond those already planned for the area.

Fire and Rescue Service

The fiscal impact of new service is for both capital and operating. Operating costs include all expenses associated with the recurring annual costs of maintaining fire rescue service. These encompass the direct operating of equipment but also include all the administrative and support functions necessary to sustain direct service to the public. The fiscal impact of applications to amend the CDMP is defined on the attached table.

Capital costs are those associated with the one time cost of capital asset acquisition such as land, equipment, and facility construction. These costs are paid through impact fees, developer contributions, the 1994 Special Obligation Bond, or other financial packages. Impact fees are paid by developers at the time of issuance of building permits. These funds are used for new station construction and equipment purchases and support services needed to serve new development. Developer contributions are designated capital funds that are provided by new developments and are conditions for development. Bond funds were voter approved in 1994 to build ten additional stations in areas already developed but requiring more service. Financial packages are generally used for major station renovations or relocations.

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | <i>Application 1</i> | | <i>Application 2</i> | | <i>Application 3</i> | |
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 33 | 62 | 4 | 6 | 53 | 177 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$35,239 | \$66,206 | \$4,271 | \$6,407 | \$56,595 | \$189,007 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$14,193,946 | \$41,484,190 | \$1,919,721 | \$2,930,616 | \$31,846,355 | \$32,385,629 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$36,791 | \$107,527 | \$4,976 | \$7,596 | \$82,546 | \$83,944 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$1,552 | \$41,321 | \$705 | \$1,189 | \$25,950 | (\$105,064) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | <i>Application 4</i> | | <i>Application 5</i> | | <i>Application 6</i> | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 65 | 131 | 40 | 961 | 0 | 3 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$69,409 | \$139,887 | \$42,713 | \$1,026,191 | \$0 | \$3,204 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$17,634,438 | \$17,728,970 | \$30,619,854 | \$25,947,977 | \$138,355 | \$1,847,040 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$45,708 | \$45,953 | \$79,367 | \$67,257 | \$359 | \$4,788 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | (\$23,701) | (\$93,933) | \$36,653 | (\$958,934) | \$359 | \$1,584 |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | <i>Application 7</i> | | <i>Application 8b</i> | | <i>Application 9</i> | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 2 | 75 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$2,136 | \$80,088 | \$2,136 | \$6,407 | \$4,271 | \$5,339 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$848,480 | \$24,280,143 | \$433,744 | \$3,710,934 | \$1,627,491 | \$1,873,975 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$2,199 | \$62,934 | \$1,124 | \$9,619 | \$4,218 | \$4,857 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$64 | (\$17,154) | (\$1,011) | \$3,212 | (\$53) | (\$482) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact (Continued) | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | Application 10 | | Application 11 | | Application 12 | |
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 10 | 310 | 2 | 153 | 3 | 23 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$10,678 | \$331,029 | \$2,136 | \$163,379 | \$3,204 | \$24,560 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$7,520,542 | \$279,784,660 | \$1,382,836 | \$44,625,966 | \$2,710,040 | \$6,661,760 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$19,493 | \$725,202 | \$3,584 | \$115,671 | \$7,024 | \$17,267 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$8,815 | \$394,172 | \$1,449 | (\$47,709) | \$3,821 | (\$7,293) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | Application 13 | | Application 14 | | Application 15 | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 4 | 130 | 12 | 34 | 34 | 74 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$4,271 | \$138,819 | \$12,814 | \$36,306 | \$36,306 | \$79,020 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$3,489,992 | \$106,662,865 | \$8,385,813 | \$9,283,499 | \$25,287,995 | \$18,416,859 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$9,046 | \$276,470 | \$21,736 | \$24,063 | \$65,546 | \$47,736 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$4,775 | \$137,651 | \$8,922 | (\$12,244) | \$29,240 | (\$31,283) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | Application 16 | | Application 17 | | Application 18 | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 8 | 72 | 16 | 231 | 57 | 122 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$8,543 | \$76,884 | \$17,085 | \$246,670 | \$60,867 | \$130,276 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$6,187,008 | \$4,964,624 | \$11,968,200 | \$26,906,660 | \$28,156,467 | \$38,030,341 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$16,037 | \$12,868 | \$31,022 | \$69,742 | \$72,982 | \$98,575 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$7,494 | (\$64,016) | \$13,936 | (\$176,928) | \$12,115 | (\$31,701) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | Application 19 | | Application 20 | | Application 21 | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 2 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 1 | 2 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$2,136 | \$5,339 | \$14,950 | \$10,678 | \$1,068 | \$2,136 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$937,847 | \$1,762,369 | \$2,381,216 | \$2,539,423 | \$311,955 | \$440,448 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$2,431 | \$4,568 | \$6,172 | \$6,582 | \$809 | \$1,142 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | \$295 | (\$771) | (\$8,778) | (\$4,096) | (\$259) | (\$994) |

| Estimated Annual Operating Fiscal Impact | Application 22 | | Application 23 | | Application 24 | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed | Current | Proposed |
| Estimated Service Impact | 93 | 223 | 4 | 250 | 1 | 49 |
| Est. Fire Rescue Budget Impact* | \$99,309 | \$238,128 | \$4,271 | \$266,959 | \$1,068 | \$52,324 |
| Estimated Property Assessment | \$26,579,124 | \$27,616,443 | \$1,540,533 | \$4,117,151 | \$220,076 | \$7,983,036 |
| Estimated Fire Rescue Tax Revenue** | \$68,893 | \$71,582 | \$3,993 | \$10,672 | \$570 | \$20,692 |
| Donor/(Recipient) Amount | (\$30,416) | (\$166,546) | (\$278) | (\$256,288) | (\$497) | (\$31,632) |

* Based on cost per alarm in FY 2004

** Based on FY 2004 Millage of 2.592

Source: Miami-Dade County Fire and Rescue

Flood Protection

The Department of Environmental Regulation Management (DERM) is restricted to the enforcement of current stormwater management and disposal regulations. These regulations require that all new development provide full on-site retention of the stormwater runoff generated by the development. The drainage systems serving new developments are not allowed to impact existing or proposed public stormwater disposal systems, or to impact adjacent properties. The County is not responsible of providing flood protection to private properties, although it is the County's responsibility to ensure and verify that said protection has been incorporated in the plans for each proposed development.

The above noted determinations are predicated upon the provisions of Chapter 46, Section 4611.1 of the South Florida Building Code; Section 24-58.3(G) of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida; Chapter 40E-40 Florida Administrative Code, Basis of Review South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD); and Section D4 Part 2 of the Public Works Manual of Miami-Dade County. All these legal provisions emphasize the requirement for full on-site retention of stormwater as a post development condition for all proposed commercial, industrial, and residential subdivisions.

Additionally, DERM staff notes that new development, within the urbanized area of the County, is assessed a stormwater utility fee. This fee commensurate with the percentage of impervious area of each parcel of land, and is assessed pursuant to the requirements of Section 24-61, Article IV, of the Code of Miami-Dade County. Finally, according to the same Code Section, the proceedings may only be utilized for the maintenance and improvement of public storm drainage systems.

Based upon the above noted considerations, it is the opinion of DERM that Ordinance No. 01-163 will not change, reverse, or affect these factual requirements.

Public Schools

The summary below provides the fiscal impacts of CDMP applications 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 on public schools for both the capital and the operating costs. Application 12 has a net reduction on both the capital and operating costs. Applications 5, 6, 7, and 14 do not impact capital or operating costs.

| Application | Additional Students | Increase in Operating Costs* | Increase in Capital Costs** |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | |
| 1 | 197 | \$1,290,153 | \$3,171,679 |
| 2 | 8 | \$52,392 | \$126,610 |
| 3 | 90 | \$589,410 | \$1,449,927 |
| 4 | 12 | \$163,725 | \$400,424 |
| 8 | 9 | \$58,941 | \$147,204 |
| 9 | 3 | \$19,647 | \$49,731 |
| 10 | 616 | \$4,034,184 | \$9,924,470 |
| 11 | 158 | \$1,034,742 | \$2,545,183 |
| 13 | 308 | \$2,017,092 | \$4,958,725 |
| 15 | 48 | \$314,352 | \$773,700 |
| 16 | 158 | \$1,034,742 | \$2,545,183 |
| 17 | 494 | \$3,235,206 | \$7,956,052 |
| 18 | 205 | \$1,342,545 | \$3,305,309 |
| 19 | 8 | \$52,392 | \$126,610 |
| 20 | 17 | \$111,333 | \$273,814 |
| 21 | 4 | \$26,196 | \$63,305 |
| 22 | 236 | \$1,545,564 | \$3,798,175 |
| 23 | 282 | \$1,846,818 | \$4,542,738 |
| 24 | 56 | \$366,744 | \$900,310 |

* Operating Cost of \$6,549 for each K-12 student.

** Capital Costs of \$13,574 per elementary student, \$15,563 per middle school, and \$20,594 per senior high student. Based on Information provided by the Florida Department of Education, Office of Educational Facilities Budgeting. Cost per student stations does not include land cost.

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING**

Diane O'Quinn Williams, Director
Subrata Basu, AIA, AICP, Assistant Director for Planning
Alberto J. Torres, Assistant Director for Zoning
Benigna Marko, Assistant Director, Administration and Operations
Maria Teresa Fojo, Chief, Land Use Development Division
Nancy Rubin, Legal Counsel

PLANNING DIVISION

Subrata Basu, AIA, AICP, Assistant Director for Planning
Dianne Hough, Executive Secretary

METROPOLITAN PLANNING SECTION

Mark R. Woerner, AICP, Chief*
Raquel Russo, Administrative Secretary

Patrick Moore, Section Supervisor*
Lynne A. Kaufman, Administrative Officer II
Helen Brown, Special Projects Administrator I
Paula H. Church, Section Supervisor
Cindy Dwyer, Principal Planner
Napoleon Somoza, Principal Planner

Rodion Iwanczuk, Principal Planner
Clark Turner, AICP Principal Planner
Frank McCune, Senior Planner
Andrew Lewis-El, Planning Technician
Oneca Lowery, Planning Technician
Jerry Bell, Consultant

PLANNING RESEARCH SECTION

Dr. Charles W. Blowers, Chief
Kimberly Keels, Administrative Secretary
Oliver Kerr, Section Supervisor
Manuel Armada, Principal Planner
Frank Baumann, Principal Planner
Shereen Andrasek, Senior Planner
Judith Charles, Senior Planner
Panos Efstathiou, Senior Planner
Antoaneta Dimitrova, Junior Planner
Omar Velasco, Junior Planner
Farida Rozy, GIS Graphics Tech. II
Jeovanny Ponton, Planning Technician
Angel Rivera, Planning Technician

COMMUNITY PLANNING SECTION

Maria Crowley, Chief
Maria Guerrero, Administrative Secretary
Pamela Gibson, Office Support Specialist II
Shailendra Singh, Section Supervisor
Thomas Spehar, Section Supervisor
Natasha Alfonso, Principal Planner
Alberto Gonzalez, Principal Planner
Gianni Lodi, Principal Planner
Michael Bregman, Senior Planner
Jess Linn, Senior Planner
Pablo Andrade, Planning Technician
Garret Rowe, Planning Tech.
Paola Jaramillo, Graphic Designer
Gary Greenan, Consultant

GRAPHICS OFFICE

Abel L. Lera, Graphics and Drafting Manager
Angela Castro, Graphics Designer
Ivonne Abreu, Graphics Designer
Eric Martinez, Cadastral Technician

*Project Managers